



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,954	07/28/2003	Stefan Kusterer	34874-073 UTIL	6169
64280	7590	09/02/2009	EXAMINER	
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111			AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/628,954

Filing Date: July 28, 2003

Appellant(s): KUSTERER ET AL.

Michael D. Van Loy
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 03/06/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 03/18/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: The rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) not 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as stated on page 12 of the Appeal Brief.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,643,661

POLIZZI

11-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 4-10, 13-18, 21, 25-31, and 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Polizzi et al. (US 6,643,661 B2). Herein referred to as Polizzi

Summary

Polizzi teaches a system that is designed to connect a plurality of users to a portal system so that users can access and process data that is stored therein. The system may also be connected to one or more back-end databases so that a user can view, process data that is stored therein (col.3, lines 62-67). The portal thus provides a one-stop interface for accessing, processing, and proving a wide variety of data to a plurality of users (col.4, lines 13-16). By using the portal system as a common interface, data can be retrieved from the back-end databases and presented to the user in a

standardized format through the web client 115. For example, a user 100 may request that the portal system 120 produce a graph illustrating the enterprise's manufacturing yield over the past year. Upon receiving the request, the portal system 120 would retrieve yield data from manufacturing back-end database 135 and process that data to generate a bar chart corresponding to the user's request. This bar chart would then be presented to the user 100 through his browser program. That same user 100 may also request, during the same session, an update of the sales figures for the enterprise for the current month. The portal system 120 would retrieve sales data from the sales back-end database 145, process that data, and generate a figure corresponding to the user's request. This data would then be presented to the user 100 through his browser program. The portal system 120 has the ability to simultaneously perform each of these tasks and present this data to the user 100 with a single interface (col.4, lines 65-67 and col.5, lines 1-17; therein Polizzi provides a system for accessing different application sources for processing a task and presenting both task results back to the users' portal interface).

Definitions

Within the portal system are:

::These definitions are defined in columns 5-7::

Service broker 125: which controls access to the portal system 120 by users 100 and controls the disposition of jobs to the service agents within the portal system.

Service agents 130: are configured to perform specific tasks within the portal system, they include: and event server 215, an authentication server 220, a name server 225, a job server 230, a repository 235, and a knowledge server 240 that includes a search server 245 and a crawl server 250.

Event Server 215: schedules events, such as jobs, for processing in the portal system 120 on a predefined timetable.

Authentication server 220: used to determine if a particular user should be granted access to the portal system 120. The permissions and group memberships for a particular user are also stored in the authentication server 220.

Name server 225: the storage location for configuration information about all of the other service agents. For example, if the service broker 125 needs to know the location of a specific job server 230, then the name server 225 will provide that information to the service broker 125.

Job server 230: used to execute jobs in the portal system 120. In addition, the job server 230 can retrieve data from a back-end database 200, 205 or 210 to be processed for a particular job. Each job server 230 may be connected to at least one back-end database 200, 205 or 210 in order to retrieve data therefrom. The job server 230 may also be a stand-alone unit, which process jobs that do not retrieve data from any external sources.

Repository 235: used as a storage device for all information that is to be stored in the portal system. All computer files that are stored in the repository 235 are called objects.

Objects: include HTML files, job output reports, executable job files (SQL, etc.), image files, etc. Objects that are stored in the repository 235 are arranged in a hierarchy called categories. Within each category, both objects and subcategories may be stored.

Categories: are organized in a tree system much like the file system on a standard computer. In addition, each object in the repository may include more than one version.

Version: versioning can be used to accomplish a variety of objectives including setting multiple security levels for different versions of an object, and allowing a user to see a modification history of an object.

Knowledge server 250: provides the search and channel functions for the portal system 120. The knowledge server 250 is comprised of two components: a search server 245 and a crawl server 250.

Crawl server 250: uses one or more crawlers to analyze and index specific information that is stored in the repository 235, a company intranet, or the Internet. A crawler can be configured to search only in certain locations in the repository 235, a company intranet, or the Internet for information to be indexed. Depending upon the settings of the crawl server 250, an information source will contain an index of objects found both within the portal system (i.e. in the repository 235), or outside the portal system (i.e. on an intranet or the Internet). The crawl server 250 is capable of indexing structured and unstructured data.

Indices: are produced by the crawl server 245 are stored in the knowledge server 240 in files called information sources.

Search server 245: uses the information sources produced by the crawl server 250 to conduct searches on behalf of a user.

Redundant service agents: for processing user requests.

Jobs: retrieve data from the back-end databases 200, 205 & 210 and process that data to generate an output report. Jobs may also be used to process data that is resident within the portal system 120. For example, jobs could include a weekly report on manufacturing statistics for the enterprise, or a report describing the current status of the enterprises' accounts receivable. Because these jobs utilize data that is retrieved directly from the back-end databases, the output reports generated by these jobs reflect an up-to-the-minute status of the corresponding aspect of the enterprise.

Subscriptions: a module that allows users to subscribe to a particular object or category that is stored in the repository 235.

Exceptions: a condition that is tied to the results of a job. Commonly found on an exceptions dashboard.

Channel: an abstract of a search, which was created by the user that has been stored in the repository for processing at a later date.

As for dependent claim 4, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 35, further comprising accepting one of the plurality of navigation connectors at the navigation service by receiving a registration request from a the one of the navigation connectors connector for a given application (col.9, lines 3-1; wherein the user defined a

link to an application source to which this link is stored on the repository; col.10, lines 27-28), receipt of the registration request resulting in the navigation service having an identifier for the one of the navigation connectors given connector (col.10, lines 50-51 and 56; wherein when a user adds an object, it will be placed in the repository with a unique identifiers (assigned to a specific category or subcategory) this connector information is stored and accessed by the name server), and receiving the navigation information receiving the navigation nodes from the one of the navigation connectors given connector, as defined by the navigation object model, the received navigation nodes including the connector identifier (col.10, lines 27-35 and col.5, lines 64-65).

As for dependent claim 5, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising selecting the one of the plurality of navigation connectors to contact based on one of the connector identifiers. (col. 9, line 56 and col.10, line 51; wherein the user can select any of the objects presented on the portal page (fig.10) at which the service broker (125) handles the request of calling the objects from the repository (235) wherein each object is identifiable with the name server 225)

As for dependent claim 6, the method of claim 35, further comprising providing a unified navigation area by displaying a navigation window in a portal presentation, the navigation window including navigation links to resources of the different application sources, the navigation links being organized according to the united navigation hierarchy (fig.10; wherein it is depicted of the organization of the user customized

portable page at which each object is organized in a hierarchy (col.5, line 65), also note that the user as evident from figure 10 has a list objects to which are in hierarchy as depicted from item (1001)).

As for dependent claim 7, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 35, further comprising: receiving a navigation action; and changing at least one of the navigation nodes in accordance with the received navigation action (col.21, line 56; wherein the user is placing a navigation action to the service broker to change the portal page at which the action of editing and adding to the portable page as noted in above claims).

As for dependent claim 8, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 35, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises merging at least two navigation objects from the different application sources based on a merge identifier (col.22, lines 33-36 and figure 10; wherein the user can merge object onto a display area as depicted by figure 10 and described as mentioned by reference in col.22).

As for dependent claim 9, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the united navigation hierarchy comprises a graph of linking relationships among navigation objects (wherein it is evident that the portal page can display a wide arrange of objects that included being of (presentation graphics, executable jobs such as brio reports, oracle reports, SAP reports to which is known in the art which can execute a graph showing linking relationships. Also note col.11, line 4 for the similar graphing of linking

relationship).

As for dependent claim 10, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 35, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises dynamically loading the united navigation hierarchy (col.23, line 46).

As for dependent claim 13, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein the navigation connectors include connector identifiers that are included in the navigation nodes to provide the navigation information (note the analysis of claim 4 above).

As for dependent claim 14, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein the navigation connectors generate the navigation nodes according to the navigation object model to provide the navigation information, the navigation nodes including at least one merge identifier that indicates similar content in two navigation nodes from different application sources and that results in a merger of the two navigation nodes (note the analysis of claims 35 and 8 below and above respectively).

As for dependent claim 15, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein the navigation nodes include a linking relationship to other nodes that are not in a parent child relationship in the homogeneous view of the navigation information (personal dashboard, wherein on is displayed nodes which are apart of the linking relationship which are displayed to the user homogeneously by user custom tailored which depicted

in figure 10 is non-parent child relationship. Also note that if the user decided to do so this could view much like a parent child relationship).

As for dependent claim 16, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein the navigation service module is configured to read data from the different application sources using the navigation connectors but not to write data to the different application sources using the navigation connectors (col.9, line 3; as previously discussed Polizzi teaches the personal dashboard to be configured to display connectors to metadata from the internet in which turn this data is being read and not written to. He also explains how there are permissions that set certain rules on items one being the restriction of writing or deleting a connector).

As for dependent claim 17, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein the navigation service module dynamically loads a united navigation hierarchy when providing the homogeneous view of the navigation information (note the analysis of claim 10 above).

As for dependent claim 18, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 17, wherein a role editor allows setting a node as a new root of the united navigation hierarchy for display for users that belong to a role (col.20, lines 61-62; wherein the user defines the root node of the object in the hierarchy to be displayed, such that when the user logs into the system they will be presented with the root node first, so thus by allowing to change this

first display object is essentially changing the root node in the hierarchy, also note the above teachings of the hierarchy).

As for dependent claim 21, Polizzi teaches the system of claim 34, wherein the navigation service module further comprises INavigationService means for abstracting navigation operations, the connector interface comprises 1NavigationConnector means for plugging an application into the INavigationService means, and the navigation data interface comprises INavigationNode means for accessing navigation information from the different application sources (col.9, line 53; the service agents: service broker, knowledge server, search server, crawl server, event server, authentication server, name server, job server, network server; wherein each of the above mentioned agents provide the means described in claim 21).

As for dependent claim 25, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, further comprising accepting one of the plurality of navigation connectors at the navigation service by comprises receiving a registration request from a the one of the navigation connectors connector for a given application (col.9, lines 3-1; wherein the user defined a link to an application source to which this link is stored on the repository; col.10, lines 27-28), receipt of the registration request resulting in the navigation service having an identifier for the one of the navigation connectors, (col.10, lines 50-51 and 56; wherein when a user adds an object, it will be placed in the repository with a unique identifiers (assigned to a specific category or subcategory) this connector information is stored and accessed

by the name server) and said receiving the navigation information by receiving the navigation nodes; from the one of the navigation connectors as defined by the navigation object model, the received navigation nodes including the connector identifier (col.10, lines 27-35 and col.5, lines 64-65).

As for dependent claim 26, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 25, wherein the operations further comprise selecting a the one of the plurality of navigation connectors to contact based on one of the connector identifiers (col.22, line 37 and figure 10)

As for dependent claim 27, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, further comprising providing a the unified navigation area displaying a navigation window in a portal presentation, the navigation window including navigation links to resources of the different application sources, the navigation links being organized according to the united navigation hierarchy (fig.10; wherein it is depicted of the organization of the user customized portable page at which each object is organized in a hierarchy (col.5, line 65), also note that the user as evident from figure 10 has a list objects to which are in hierarchy as depicted from item (1001)).

As for dependent claim 28, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, wherein the operations further comprise: receiving a navigation action; and changing at least one of the navigation nodes in accordance with the received navigation action (col.21, line 56; wherein the user is placing a navigation action to the service broker to change the portal page at which the action of editing and adding to the portable page as noted in above claims).

As for dependent claim 29, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises merging at least two navigation objects from the different application sources based on a merge identifier (col.22, lines 33-36 and figure 10; wherein the user can merge object onto a display area as depicted by figure 10 and described as mentioned by reference in col.22).

As for dependent claim 30, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 29, wherein the united navigation hierarchy comprises a graph of linking relationships among navigation objects (wherein it is evident that the portal page can display a wide arrange of objects that included being of (presentation graphics, executable jobs such as brio reports, oracle reports, SAP reports to which is known in the art which can execute a graph showing linking relationships. Also note col.11, line 4 for the similar graphing of linking relationship).

As for dependent claim 31, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, wherein uniting the navigation hierarchies further comprises dynamically loading the united navigation hierarchy (col.23, line 46).

As for independent claim 34, Polizzi teaches a portal system comprising: an integration layer (a category stored in the repository 235) comprising a navigation service module residing on a first programmable machine (col.4, lines 39-43), the navigation service module defining a connector interface (figure 3 and col.10, lines 27-45; the name server is a registrar of all connections within the portal system, for

example the name server stores the information which connects (or creates and outputs connectors/connections) jobs to applications, back-end databases, users, the service broker, etc, thus the name server is a central registration component that determines and keeps track of connectors/ connections/ links); a data layer comprising the plurality of application sources, each of the application sources creating an application-specific hierarchy (col.14, line 25) the plurality of application sources residing on one or more additional programmable machines that communicate over a network with the navigation service module on the first programmable machine (col.4, lines 40-43 and col.5, lines 29-34 and figures 1 and 2) and an equal number of navigation connectors to the navigation service, each one of the plurality of application sources providing one of the navigation connectors by implementing the defined connector interface on the one or more additional programmable machines and by generating one or more navigation nodes that represent data objects in the each one of the plurality of application sources (figure 2,3 and 7; col.5, lines 50-51 and col.17, lines 24-65; wherein a user has a link displayed on their portal web page which is a link to a job for reporting sales figures for the quarter. That job link is connected to a job server where the job server is connected to an application/ program source along with other information pertaining to the job server. The request to process the job is handled by the service broker at which all of these connections are handled by the name server which functions as a connector interface for connecting the portal elements together by creating, deleting, updating connectors on an ad-hoc basis) and a presentation layer (115) that resides on the first programmable machine and that comprises one or more navigation applications that

obtain navigation information from module the navigation service, the navigation service module uniting the navigation nodes provided by the plurality of navigation connectors to provide a homogeneous view of navigation information from the plurality of application sources by uniting the application-specific navigation hierarchies from each of the plurality of application sources into a united application hierarchy that is presented to one or more clients running on one or more client machines (figure 10; col.7, lines 65-67; col.8, lines 1-21; col.11, lines 42-46; col.22, lines 33-64). *Additionally, the name server 225 is a connector interface (figure 3 and column 10, lines 27-45); the name server is a registrar of all connections within the portal system, for example the name server stores the information which connects (or creates and outputs connectors/connections) jobs to applications, back-end databases, users, etc, thus the name server is a central registration component that determines and keeps track of connectors/ connections/ links. While the service broker 125, functions as a navigation service module, in that it controls access to the portal system 120 by a particular user 100. The service broker also provides session management services for users, and acts as a gateway to the other service agents within the portal system. The service broker dispatches user request to an appropriate service agent with help of the name server (col.9, lines 54-60). With this understanding it is clear that Polizzi teaches of a navigation service module and connector interface with different termed elements service broker and name server as both service broker and name server function similar to navigation service module and connector interface (figure 3 and column 10, lines 27-*

45).

As for independent claim 35, Polizzi teaches a method comprising: operating one or more navigation applications residing on a first programmable machine (col.4, lines 39-44) in a presentation layer of a navigation model architecture, a navigation service module residing on the first programmable machine (figure 1) in an integration layer of the navigation model architecture, and a plurality of application sources residing on one or more additional programmable machines communication over a network with the navigation service module on the first programmable machine, each of the application sources creating an application-specific hierarchy (figure 1 and 2; col.5, lines 29-34; col.14, line 25) in a data layer of the navigation model architecture (note the analysis of claim 34; wherein explained are the integration layer, data layer and presentation layer and how applications are handled in each layer); implementing a connector interface on the one or more additional programmable machines, the connector interface being defined by the navigation service module and causing on each of the plurality of application sources to provide one navigation connector to the navigation service for each of the plurality of application sources, each navigation connector providing one or more navigation nodes that represent data objects in the one of the plurality of application sources that provides the navigation connector (figure 2,3 and 7; col.5, lines 50-51 and col.17, lines 24-65); and uniting the navigation nodes to provide, via the one or more navigation applications, a homogeneous view of navigation information from the plurality of application sources by uniting the application

specific navigation hierarchies from each of the plurality of application sources into a unified, consistent application hierarchy (“personal dashboard”; col.22, lines37-64, wherein the user has the ability to customize their dashboard to have certain objects displayed). Further note the analysis of claim 34 above.

As for dependent claim 36, Polizzi teaches an article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising: operating one or more navigation applications residing on a first programmable machine in a presentation layer of a navigation model architecture, a navigation service module residing on the first programmable machine (col.4, lines 40-44 and col.5, lines 30-33; figure 1 and 2) in an integration layer of the navigation model architecture, and a plurality of application sources residing on one or more additional programmable machines (col.5, lines 29-34) in a data layer of the navigation model architecture, the one or more additional programmable machines communicating over a network with the navigation service module on the first programmable machine, each of the application sources creating the application-specific hierarchy (note the analysis of claim 34; wherein explained are the integration layer, data layer and presentation layer and how applications are handled in each layer); implementing a connector interface on the one or more additional programmable machines, the connector interface being defined by the navigation service module and causing each of the plurality of application sources to provide one navigation connector to the navigation service for each of the plurality of application sources, each navigation connector providing one or more

navigation nodes that represent data objects in the one of the plurality of application sources that provides the navigation connector (figure 2,3 and 7; col.5, lines 50-51 and col.17, lines 24-65); and uniting the navigation nodes to provide, via the one or more navigation applications, a homogeneous view of navigation information from the plurality of application sources by uniting application specific navigation hierarchies from each of the plurality of application sources into a unified, consistent application hierarchy by merging two or more of the navigation nodes from two or more of the application sources that are related to a same issue (“personal dashboard”; col.22, lines37-64, wherein the user has the ability to customize their dashboard to have certain objects displayed, thus the user is able to “merge” per se anything object wise to the personal dashboard or even other areas of the portal system web page such as areas: 1001,1015,1020). Further note the analysis of claim 34 above.

As for dependent claim 37, Polizzi teaches the portal system of claim 34, wherein one or more of the plurality of application sources are chosen from a group consisting of Web services, an enterprise base system, a human resource management system, a customer relationship management system, a financial management system, a knowledge management system, a business warehouse system, a time management system, and an electronic file or mail system (col.11, lines 55-57).

As for dependent claim 38, Polizzi teaches the method of claim 35, wherein one or more of the plurality of application sources are chosen from a group consisting of Web services, an enterprise base system, a human resource management system, a customer relationship management system, a financial management system, a knowledge management system, a business warehouse system, a time management system, and an electronic file or mail system (col.11, lines 55-57; Polizzi system handles applications sources specific for a business enterprise system).

As for dependent claim 39, Polizzi teaches the article of claim 36, wherein one or more of the plurality of application sources are chosen from a group consisting of Web services, an enterprise base system, a human resource management system, a customer relationship management system, a financial management system, a knowledge management system, a business warehouse system, a time management system, and an electronic file or mail system (col.11, lines 55-57).

(10) Response to Argument

Beginning on page 14 of Appellant's brief (herein after "Brief"), Appellant argues specific issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

A1. Appellant argues on page 15 of the Brief that Polizzi does not disclose "each of the plurality of application sources creating an application-specific hierarchy".

R1. Examiner does not agree, Polizzi directly teaches in column 14, lines 25-28 and 32-37 that there is a hierarchical arrangement of properties associated with a job, wherein each job will have a job specific hierarchy. In column 6, lines 34-49 it is disclosed that jobs are described as applications, in that they retrieve data (input) and process the retrieved data to output the data to the graphical user interface (portal interface) to the user.

In column 5, lines 55-57 Polizzi teaches that jobs are managed from a job server, wherein the job server can pull data from back-end database different from the repository 235. This shows that the job sources (application sources) are part or could be part of a data layer and not explicitly part of the integration layer (in response to Appellants remark in paragraph 1 of page 16).

A2. Appellant argues on page 16 of the Brief that Polizzi does not disclose the presentation of a unified, consistent application hierarchy into which the application-specific hierarchies are united.

R2. Examiner does not agree Polizzi teaches of a portal page that is used to provide information from a plurality of information sources to be displayed to a plurality of users of the system wherein some information presented is presented to all users and some information is user specific (in addition the user can modify/edit user's portal page); column 20, lines 45-66. Polizzi then describes all of the data that is presented to the

user included the information as discussed in R1 above; column 23, line 47 - column 24, line 7 and column 24, lines 35-53; it is described as presenting to the user of the jobs and the job properties (INPUT objects, ASK form, etc...). As discussed before in R1 with the hierarchical arrangement of job specific hierarchies, this section of Polizzi is the presentation of this information on a personal dashboard (portal page).

A3. Appellant argues on page 17 of the Brief that Polizzi's descriptions of links and/or jobs does not anticipate the instantly claimed data layer that includes a plurality of application sources and an equal number of navigation connectors that are provided by the application sources implementing the connector interface defined by the navigation service module.

R3. Examiner does not agree, Polizzi teaches in figures 2,3 and 7; column 5, lines 50-51 and column 17, lines 24-65 it is described wherein a user has a link displayed on their portal page (dash board) which there is a link to a job for reporting sales figures for the quarter. That job link is connected to a job server where the job server is connected to an application/ program source along with other information pertaining to the job and server (a job may require a fresh set of data to be retrieved from a back-end database 200, 205 or 210 (data layer; that is remote from the portal system 120) which is different from the repository 235 (integration layer) that stores the portal system. (column 24, lines 8-12).

A4. Appellant argues on page 19 of the Brief that Polizzi fails to disclose that the claimed navigation connectors have a one-to-one relationship with each of the plurality of application sources.

R4. Examiner does not agree, Polizzi teaches a discussed in R3 above that presented on the user's portal page (dashboard) are links to jobs and/or objects (object being one of a plurality of multimedia information such as a html document). The presentation of these links provide direct access to one source of information, such as link A is a tie to job A and link B is a tie to object B and so on (column 23, line 47 - column 24, line 7).

A5. Appellant argues on page 20 of the Brief that Polizzi's name server 225 cannot anticipate both the connector interface and the navigation service module or that Polizzi does not teach a connector interface and a navigation service module.

R5. Examiner does not agree, what was trying to be conveyed in the last office action was that the name server 225 is a connector interface (figure 3 and column 10, lines 27-45); the name server is a registrar of all connections within the portal system, for example the name server stores the information which connects (or creates and outputs connectors/connections) jobs to applications, back-end databases, users, etc, thus the name server is a central registration component that determines and keeps track of connectors/ connections/ links. While the service broker 125, functions as a navigation service module, in that it controls access to the portal system 120 by a particular user 100. The service broker also provides session management services for users, and acts

as a gateway to the other service agents within the portal system. The service broker dispatches user request to an appropriate service agent with help of the name server (col.9, lines 54-60). With this understanding it is clear that Polizzi teaches of a navigation service module and connector interface with different termed elements service broker and name server as both service broker and name server function similar to navigation service module and connector interface.

A6. Appellant argues on page 21 of the Brief that Polizzi fails to disclose that the integration layer and presentation layer reside on a first programmable machine and the plurality of application sources and the navigation connectors by the application sources implementing the defined connector interface reside on one or more additional programmable machines distinct from the first programmable machine.

R6. Examiner does not agree, Polizzi as described above in R1; In column 5, lines 55-57, Polizzi teaches that jobs are managed from a job server, wherein the job server can pull data (application sources and navigation connectors) from back-end database different from the repository 235; wherein the repository stores the presentation and integration layer. This shows that the job sources (application sources) are part or could be part of a data layer and not explicitly part of the integration layer. Column 5, lines 59-65; column 6, lines 34-38 and 47-58.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

Conferees:

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179

Michael D. Van Loy
Reg. No. 52,315
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92310